

*Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit
Mary, Seat of Wisdom, Pray for us.*

Vancouver Christ the King Monastery
Lecture 1: Tuesday, January 3 afternoon

Man and Woman in Ancient Philosophy: The PreSocratics ask the Fundamental Questions; Plato and Aristotle provide the First Two Theories (Unisex and sex polarity)

I. Introduction

Overview of the four lectures giving historical development of the philosophy of man and women in western thought with a mathematical analogy

✓ **A. Time-line of philosophical development**

1. 750 BC-1400 interpreted man and woman as **male and female**, analogous to a single point in geometrical design.
2. 1400-1800 added reflection on **masculine and feminine** as analysis of psyche began to be part of philosophical considerations, analogous to two further points providing the vertices of two triangles
3. 1800-1920 added a further development, **man as individual and woman as individual** in challenge to define the self away from the mass, analogous to adding a further vertex and for the first time becoming three dimensional, as a tetrahedron
4. 1920-present added a **relational development through the concept of man as person and woman as person**. Here the individual becomes a person in relation to other persons, in building communities, analogous to the formation of complex three dimensional structures out of the combination of individual tetrahedrons or spirals.

✓ **B. A philosophical defense for integral sex and gender complementarity (the integral complementarity of woman and man) is compatible with faith.**

1. This compatibility has taken over two thousand years to be developed.
2. Science is self-correcting over time.
3. We are fortunate to live in a time of history when the theory of generation provides important evidence for the four principles of complementarity revealed in *Genesis*.

✓ C. The four principles of gender complementarity are revealed in *Genesis*

1. The principle of **equal dignity** is revealed in **Genesis 1:26**: "*Let us make man [the human being] in our image, after our likeness.*"
2. The principle of **significant difference** is revealed in **Genesis 1:27**: "*In the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.*"
3. The principle of **synergetic relation of a woman and a man** is revealed in **Genesis 1:28**: "*And God blessed them, and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply' ...* and in **Genesis 2:24** "...*They became one flesh.*"
4. The principle of **intergenerational fruition** is revealed in **Genesis 5:1-32**: "*This is the book of the generations*" and in the subsequent listing of those who generated one generation after another from Adam to Noah.

✓ D. The four principles of gender complementarity have been verified by science and philosophy today in the science of generation.

1. Women and men provide a contribution of **equal dignity** to generation in the same number of chromosomes
2. Women and men provide a **significant difference** to generation in both the structure of one of the chromosomes and in the specific way a woman generates in herself and a man generates in another.
3. When this way of relation occurs at the fertile time for conception, then the man/ woman relation is often **synergetic**.
4. When a human being is conceived and the mother fosters its growth through birth, then the real, **integral complementarity of the woman and man becomes intergenerationally fruitful**.

✓ E. The contemporary understanding of the relation of sex and gender identity.

1. **Our sex identity is (always or for the most part) male or female.** It is a one dimensional point of reference. An infant has a sex identity verified by science in chromosomes, anatomy, and physiology.

2. There are always exceptions in nature but the exception does not destroy the rule. Persons who have ambiguous sex identity often suffer from this being an exception.

3. Our gender identity is a three dimensional point of reference. Its starting point is our sexual embodiment as male or female. Gender identity includes other layers of human existence, namely our consciousness, our self-awareness, our maturing self-development, self-mastery, self-governance, relations with others, and often our relation in prayer with the God who has created us for a specific vocation. We form ourselves over time individually into a particular way of being a man or of being a woman.

4. Gender identity is about the whole woman and the whole man. It is not just about sex activity. The etymological root of gender, *gen*, means to reproduce, to breed, and to generate. Gender identity includes sex identity whether or not there is sex activity. We all need to use the word 'gender' in its meaning of **gender reality**.

2. The pre-Socratics raise the fundamental questions:

a. By studying the fragments of the pre-Socratics I was able to discover four basic categories of questions which will be classified under the headings: [opposites, generation, wisdom, and virtue.]

Opposites

1. We could call this the metaphysical question: Are men and women opposite, or the same? Heraclitus (c. 540-480BC) said: "There would be no harmony without sharps and flats, no living beings without male and female, which are contraries." (Aristotle 1235a26) Heraclitus considered opposites to be in a relation similar to the bow and lyre, rather than as contradictories, so it would seem that he does not value one of these pair of opposites as superior to the other. (although he does value the hot and dry over the cold and moist because of the priority of the element fire)

2. What is the relation between the opposites male and female and other pairs of opposites? In Metaphysics (986a 22-25) Aristotle records the Pythagorean tradition as listing a

table of ten opposites, "limit and absence of limit, odd and even, one and many, right and left, male and female, rest and motion, straight and curved, light and dark, good and bad, and square and oblong." (986a 22-25) Within this listing it is clear that a polarity has been described in which the first member of the pair is given a superior valuation over the second member.

3. Another question raised by the pre-Socrates was: Is the theory that male and female are opposites describing something about reality itself, or is it only something about appearance? Parmenides (c.539-500BC) in *On Nature* argued that in the Way of Truth there are no divisions, while in the Way of Opinion philosophers describe a lower goddess (daemon) who rules over birth and mating, "sending the female to mate with the male, and conversely again the male with the female." (frag, 12) So sexual differentiation for Parmenides is simply an appearance, and not a feature of reality itself.

4. Finally the pre-Socratics wondered about whether particular pairs of opposites have a unique relation to either the male or the female sex. In the Hippocratic tradition this connection is made explicit. Here we find in the Hippocratic text *Regimen*, the explicit association of the hot and the dry with the male, and the cold and the moist with the female: "The males of all species are warmer and drier, and the females moister and colder." (I, xxxiv) This particular association will prove to be a central metaphysical claim that will influence the development of the philosophy of man and woman until the 17th century.

Another, more minor association follows from the Pythagorean rather than the Hippocratic tradition, namely that the male is associated with the right and the female with the left. This metaphysical claim was give practical application in biological theory of generation which will be described shortly.

Generation

The second category of questions raised by the pre-Socratics concerned the relation of the respective functions of mothering and fathering in generation to sex identity. These questions focused on three different areas; cosmic generation, the generation of first parents, and continuity of generation.

1. What is the role of male and female identity in cosmic myths of generation of the universe? Hesiod's Theogony gave the classical pre scientific explanation of the interaction of Father Sky and Mother Earth in a battle of polar opposition for the dominance of one over the other. The pre-Socratic philosophers sought to describe this cosmic generation in natural terms, rather than using mythological or religious descriptions.

2. How did the first men and women appear in the world? Anaximander (c. 540 BC), the student of Thales suggested that "fish like creatures burst open, and out came men and women who were able to feed themselves." (Kahn 110) Empedocles (c. 450BC) developed an elaborate theory of cycles of love and of hate in which all created beings were generated out of the four

elements of earth, air, fire and water. The elements were combined by love into limbs, then monstrous hermaphrodites, and eventually combined into men and women. "There arose offspring of men with heads of cattle; and (creatures made of elements) mixed in part from men, in part of female sex, furnished with hairy limbs." (frag. 57)

3. Do both parents produce fertile seed in generation, or only one? How is sex identity determined in the fetus? These two questions received the most attention from the pre-Socratic philosophers. For example Parmenides, in his Way of Opinion suggested that both male and female provide a single fertile seed in generation, but he added the cryptic phrase: "On the right, boys, on the left, girls." (frag. 17) This has been interpreted to imply that the placement of the fetus on the right side of the uterus, or a seed from the right testicle from the father will produce a male child, and vice-versa for the female. There is some disagreement about Anaxagoras' (500-428BC) theory, with Aristotle suggesting that he denied the existence of female seed, and Censorious and Plutarch suggesting that he did. ^{support the existence of female seed} In any event, all commentators ^{have} mention that Anaxagoras invoked the opposites 'right and left' to explain the determination of the sex of the fetus, with a boy being associated with the right testicle and right side of the uterus, and the female with the left.

Perhaps the most interesting thinking in this area occurred in the works of Empedocles, who was after all a physician as well as philosopher. He is the only pre-Socratic who suggested the theory that each sex provided 1/2 of the seed needed for generation, the theory we accept today in genetics. He said: "The substance of (the child's) limbs is divided (between them), part

in the man's body and part in the woman's." (frag. 62) In Empedocles, we find the first suggestion of sex complementarity. Even Aristotle noted this in his *Generation of Animals*:

"Empedocles—the two parents do not both supply the same portion, and that is why they need intercourse with each other." (722b 15) In subsequent lectures we will see how this

complementarity between male and female can be elaborated. Before leaving Empedocles it should be mentioned that he invoked the opposites 'hot and cold' rather than 'right and left' to explain the differentiation of the fetus into male or female. If the uterus is hot, the child will be a male, if cold a female. If the seed is hot, then it will resemble the father, if cold the mother. So we have four combinations of a boy who resembles his father, a boy who resembles his mother, a girl who resembles her father, and a girl who resembles her mother.

Even Democritus (c.460-370BC) considered the question of the relation of sex identity to the continuity of generation. However, he argued that there was a battle between the mother and father who each provided a single seed, and the child was the result of which parent won the battle. So instead of the cooperative model of Empedocles, we have a polarity model of dominance and antagonism.

Finally, the Hippocratic tradition argued for a double-seed theory, so both the mother and the father provided seed to generation. In addition, the seeds are described as mixing to produce the child. However, a new polarity is introduced in the opposites 'strong and weak', so a female child is the result of a greater quantity of weak seed, and a male of strong seed.

This short summary has shown, then, that the philosophy of science in its primitive form considered seriously the question of sex identity as it relates to biological issues of male and female identity.

Wisdom

Under the category of wisdom there were several different questions asked by the pre-Socratic philosophers.

1) Can both women and men become philosophers? The Pythagorean's encouraged women to study philosophy, that is, to use their reason, particularly mathematically reasoning, and the observation of their senses in the search for truth. We know that Pythagoras was very successful as a teacher of women, and that separate assemblies were arranged for him to teach them. The name of Theano is well known, and although the early Pythagorean school was dissolved by the end of the fourth century BC, the later movements of neo-Pythagoreanism, one in southern Italy in the mid-third century BC and another moving from Alexandrian and Athens to Italy in the beginning of the second century BC contained several women philosophers, fragments of whose writings still exist. (Thesleff, xxix,3; Waithe I,3) When we ask how this example fits with the Pythagorean table in which woman is devalued, a clue may be found in the Pythagorean theory of reincarnation, and the dualism of body and soul. The same, sexless soul may be reincarnated in a female body, which would be less valued in some ways. However, the study of philosophy could lead to a better development of soul.

2) There is also a question of whether or not there were any women philosophers in this early time in western history. Some list Aspasia, but the only evidence seems to point to a possible talent in rhetoric. (Plato 237e-249d) Socrates suggests in the *Symposium* that Diotima not only taught him about the true nature of love but that she actually invented the often called 'Socratic Method' of question and answer." (336c) However, there is no evidence to corroborate that Diotima was a real historical person. So the only thing that can be said is that probably women had developed some skill in philosophical reasoning within the Pythagorean tradition.

In contrast to this openness towards women philosophers, a fragment from Democritus (c.460-370 BC) said: "A woman must not practice argument: this is dreadful." (frag 110)

3. Protagoras, according to Aristotle was the first philosopher to think about the masculine and feminine gender of words in language, ^{neuter re. inanimate*} (T73b 18-30) and in the Hippocratic writings it is suggested that boys and men are more brilliant because their constitution has a greater amount of heat. (Regimen xxviii)

All of these examples simply reinforce the impression that from the very beginnings of western philosophy, a related series of questions about sex identity were central to philosopher's thinking.

Virtue

The final category of questions raised by the pre-Socratics fall under the broad classification of virtue. 1) The first question that arose was whether or not men and women ought

to practice the same or different virtues? Pythagoras, who thought that the most important thing in life was to win the soul to good or evil, argued that both men and women ought to have the same harmony of soul that followed the practice of chastity, monogamy. He is reputed have directly supported "a friendship of all towards all...of a man towards his wife." (Vogel, 100-1)

However, he also introduced the claim that a man and woman were virtuous by practicing a different virtue in relation to one another, ruling for the man and obeying for the woman. The separation of the virtue of ruling and obedience according to sex identity was reinforced in Xenophon's (c. 430-357 BC) Oeconomicus in which Isomachus tells Socrates that just one word from him "was enough to secure her instant obedience." (IX 18-19)

The question of whether men and women have the same or different virtues was also considered in relation to the question of the proper sphere of activity. Plato describes the follower of the Sophist Gorgias in the Meno as arguing: "First of all, if it is a manly virtue you are after, it is easy to see that the virtue of a man consists in managing the city's affairs capably...Or if you want a woman's virtue,...she must be a good housewife, careful of her stores and obedient to her husband...For every act and every time of life, with reference to each separate function, there is a virtue for each one of us, and similarly, I should say, a vice." (71d-73c) A man practices virtue in the public sphere and a woman in the private sphere of activities. Xenophon repeats this theory in greater detail and makes the three fold argument that the private and public spheres of virtue are divinely ordained, integrated into law, and subject to reinforcement when transgressed. (VII, 26-7)

Therefore, in this early time of philosophy we have the primary stipulation that at least two pairs of virtues are sexually differentiated by some philosophers, namely, ruling and obedience, and activity in the public and private spheres.

C

C

C

Lecture One Continued Part Two

3. Plato, the Founder of the Sex Unity Theory

Before describing Plato's contribution to the philosophy of man and woman in ancient thought a summary of the different theories of sex identity will be given, using the two key categories of differentiation (Are there philosophically significant differences between woman and man?) and equality (Are woman and man fundamentally equal in dignity and worth?)

<u>differentiation</u>		<u>equality</u>
<u>sex unity</u>	no	yes
<u>sex polarity</u>		
<u>traditional</u>	yes (male>)	no
<u>reverse</u>	yes (female>)	no
<u>sex complementarity</u>		
<u>fractional</u>	yes	yes
(1/2 + 1/2 = 1)		
<u>integral</u>	yes	yes
(1 + 1 ⇒ 3)		

(sex neutrality) ignores arguments about sex identity, and may contain hidden elements of any or all of the above theories)

Plato's theory of man and woman (c. 428-355BC)

It should be noted that on the cosmic level Plato does contain some elements of sex polarity. In the myth of the *Timaeus*, he describes a great Mother Receptacle who is totally passive existing only to receive the forms which act like a Father. (51b) In the same dialogue Plato also suggests that in relation to his theory of reincarnation: "Of the men who came into the world, those who were cowards or led unrighteous lives may with reason be supposed to have changed into the nature of women in the second generation." (34c) This myth certainly implies an inferiority in the condition of women in the world.

However, what is significant about Plato is not the above reflections, but rather the arguments offered in *Republic* and *Laws* for the equality of men and women on the basis of a similarity of soul. Here, through Socrates, Plato suggests that even though women are weaker, they ought to be given the same education, allowed to do all the same functions as men in an ideal society, presumably to free the soul from its series of incarnations by the study of philosophy as suggested in the *Phaedrus*. In short, Plato concludes in the *Republic*: "Then there is no pursuit of the administrators of a state that belongs to a woman because she is a woman or to a man because he is a man. But the natural capacities are distributed alike among both creatures, and woman is weaker than the man" (455c-e)

A similar conclusion is reached to the question of whether women can become philosopher guardians of the state, the highest role for a philosopher. In the *Republic* Socrates concludes after considering that women and men have the same capacities of soul: "The women and the men, then, have the same nature in respect to the guardianship of the state, save in so far as the one is weaker, the other stronger." (455e-456a) Then in both the *Republic* and *Laws* a

theory of education is elaborated to enable the woman, who is a slightly weaker incarnation of soul to 'catch up' to man.

The critical aspects of Plato's contribution can be summarized as follows:

1. While the pre-Socratics left isolated and often unconnected fragments in the philosophy of man and woman, **Plato was reaching for a theory which flowed across all four categories of questions delineated by opposites, generation, wisdom and virtue. He concluded that women and men are not opposites, but the same.** Human beings consisted primarily in a sexless soul which was reincarnated in all sorts of different bodies-male/female, human/animal. The task of life on earth was to become wise through education, and then to help others through the practice of virtue. Men and women had the same functions and therefore they had the same virtues. He concluded that the structures in society ought to be changed so that this sex unity model of humanity could be put into practice in an ideal *Republic*. Therefore, even though sex polarity might be the way that society was presently organized, the true philosophy would support a ^{unity} sex unity theory.

2. The other interesting aspect of Plato's philosophy that should be noted, is that it devalues the body. This devaluation of the body will be seen in subsequent lectures to be a consistent pattern in sex unity theories. For Plato only the soul matters. "If it appears that they differ only in just this respect that the female bears and the male begets, we shall say that no proof has yet been produced that the woman differs from the man for our purposes, but we shall continue to think

that our guardian and their wives ought to follow the same pursuits." (454c-e)

The consequences of this Platonic devaluation of the body are well known, and include the separation of mothers from their children/even to the extent of hiding the knowledge of the natural parent/ So in this model the family ceases to exist as a source of community life, and so on. Again we will see similar suggestions in contemporary sex unity theorists.

Another interesting side effect of Plato's theory is that he appeared to welcome actual women into his school of philosophy at the Academy. Diogenes Laertius, after listing the names of many male members of the Academy stated: "And many others, among them two women, Lastheneia of Mantinea and Axiothea of Philius, who is reported by Dicaerchus to have worn men's clothes." (III, 46) This single fragment is intriguing as it seems to suggest that one woman, at least, even lost her external sex identity as a woman, and took on the male identity as another expression of the devaluation of the body within this tradition. This pattern will also be found in contemporary sex unity philosophers.

In any event, Plato stands out as being the first philosopher to offer a theory across all four categories which had previously been identified by the pre-Socratics. The main orientation of his thinking was towards the sex unity position, and therefore, I call him the 'founder of the sex unity position.'

4. Aristotle as the Founder of the Sex Polarity Theory

It should be mentioned at the outset that Aristotle had the more correct theory of the human being in relation to Plato, his teacher. While Plato fell into a soul/body dualism, Aristotle insisted on the unity of form and matter, and of the soul as the act of the body. This means, that Aristotle must be recognized as positing the first correct statement of the relation of rationality and materiality in the human being in western Philosophy. The human being is a form/matter composite; or soul/body composite. This theory of the necessary integration of soul and body in the human being indirectly undermines Plato's metaphysical basis for the equality of man and woman, namely the posit of human identity in the existence of a sexless soul.

In addition, Aristotle directly criticized Plato's theory of man and woman in Book II of *Politics* where he pointed out that the destruction of family identity has the potential of undermining the very existence of the civis. He therefore, attacked the consequences of Plato's sex unity theory and claimed that it would be detrimental to the formation of the identity of individuals altogether. "Each citizen will have a thousand sons individually, but anyone will be equally the son of anybody, and will therefore be neglected by all alike." (1261b23-1262a3)

The fact that Aristotle was correct in his positing of the unity of the human being, leads to **a paradox in that this very unity becomes the focal point for the devaluation of woman in relation to man**. However, as will be seen in subsequent lectures, the Aristotelian line of thought about human beings in general provides the most promising line for the future development of a theory of sex complementarity.

* Specifically, his metaphysical hylomorphism the form/matter soul/body composite identity of the human being (man/woman) is one of the two living ideas - on which the dependence of the interdependent complementarity of woman and man depends.

Aristotle's theory of man and woman (384-322 BC)

↓ Aristotle is the first philosopher to develop a completely consistent argument about woman and man across all four categories of opposites, generation, wisdom, and virtue. His philosophy, in fact, intertwines an argument from one category to another, so that it forms a cohesive whole in defense of traditional sex polarity, or the view that there are philosophically significant differences between the sexes, and that men are by nature superior to women.

Opposites

✶ Under the category of opposites Aristotle asks in Book X of the Metaphysics: "One might raise the question why woman does not differ from man in species, when female and male are contrary and their difference is a contrariety." (1058a 29-31) Male and female are an example of a contrariety of matter, and not of form, and therefore, he concluded that the contrariety did not constitute a ground for concluding that men and women constitute a difference in species. The difference was not a difference in kind but of degree.

With all contraries, one is a privation of the other, and so it follows that the female could be seen as a privation of the male. So just as cold is the privation of hot, the female is the privation of the male.

Even though every substance, and in this case every woman or man has both form and matter, Aristotle none the less began to identify the female in The Generation of Animals with

the function of providing material to generation and the male with providing the form. "The female always provides the material, the male that which fashions the material into shape; this, in our view, is the specific characteristic of each sex." (738b 20-25). In the same text, he claims that the male is "better and more divine" than the female because it has the "principle of movement for generated things." (732a 5-10) Finally, Aristotle argues that "the female, qua female, is passive, and the male, qua male, is active—it is that whence the principle of movement comes." (729b 15-20)

So in the questions of opposites, we find the female is defined as the contrary privation of the male, and that the female nature is passive and the male nature is active.

Generation

A further pair of opposites with direct relation to sexual differentiation elaborated by Aristotle in his biological and zoological writings is the pair 'hot and cold'. He claims that males are by nature hotter than females, and that as a consequence the male can 'boil' up his blood to make fertile seed. The female, as colder is unable to heat her blood further than to make milk. (Aristotle did not know of the circulation of the blood). What this meant is that males only provided seed in generation, and females provided the material that the seed acted upon.

Aristotle argued further that the greater coldness in women meant that she was an inferior kind of human being. *In Parts of Animals* he says "the woman is as it were an infertile male, the female, in fact, is female on account of an inability of a sort, viz. it lacks the power to concoct semen out of the final state of nourishment...because of the coldness of its nature." (728a 13-27) He also refers in the same text to the female as having an 'inability', and of being a

'deformed male'. (765b 10-18, 737a 26-30).

Finally, Aristotle gave very careful consideration to the way in which female and male fetuses were formed. In *Generation of Animals* and *History of Animals* he argues that if the male seed gains mastery over the female material it will produce a male that resembles the father. If there is some failure in mastery then there will be a male that resembles the mother, a female that resembles the father, a female that resembles the mother, or no conception at all. ("If [the male seed] gains the mastery, it brings [the material] over to itself; but if it gets mastered, it changes over either into its opposite or else into extinction. And the opposite of the male is the female." (766b 16-20) Therefore, the generation of a female is a departure from the type of male which ought to have been generated in any particular occasion. Aristotle did reflect that nature arranged it well so that females would be produced to allow the race to continue. It was "necessity of nature" that there be these derivations in type which produced the female. (767b 10-15)

Before leaving the category of generation it should be mentioned in passing that Aristotle also differentiated between the sexes with the statement that a male generates in another and the female generates in herself. This distinction remains true today. This distinction will also play an important role in theories of cosmic generation.

Wisdom

As a consequence of the defective formation of the female in generation, she does not develop to the fullness that a human being is capable. In the *Politics* Aristotle argues that the woman has a rational faculty, but that it is weaker than a man's. The specific passage reads as

follows: "Although the parts of the soul are present in all of them, they are present in different degrees. For the slave has no deliberative faculty at all; the woman has, but it is without authority, and the child has, but it is immature." (1260a 1-5) The key here is the phrase '**without authority**'. The important aspect of a man's rationality if he is to practice theoretical and practical wisdom, according to Aristotle, is that he be able to think through theoretical and practical syllogisms. If a woman, by nature, has a deliberative faculty that is without authority, it means that she has difficulty governing herself, her emotions, or passions. This incapacity is seen as part of woman's natural character. Even in the *Poetics* Aristotle remarks that "it is not appropriate for a female character to be manly or clever." (1254a 6-13) The natural identification of woman with the irrational aspect of the mind was a consistent conclusion drawn from Aristotle's theory of her defective generation. The mind simply did not usually develop to its full human potential in women.

Consequently, Aristotle would limit women to the search for 'true opinion' rather than wisdom as such. He argues: "Practical wisdom only is characteristic of the ruler... The virtue of the subject is certainly not wisdom, but only true opinion." (1277b 27-30) This would mean that women and men are wise in different ways, flowing from their nature. It is not surprising that Aristotle concluded that a woman ought not to participate in public life of conversation when he stated: "All classes must be deemed to have their special attributes; as the poet says of women, 'Silence is a woman's glory,' but this is not equally the glory of man." It is also not surprising that there were no women philosophers in the Peripatetic school. So while sex unity theory seems to be open to women philosophers, perhaps with the loss of their identity as

women, the sex unity theory seems to not offer any place for women philosophers.

Virtue

Aristotle's argues that there ought to be separate virtues for women and men. He links up his previous theory of the defective generation of the female with the particular virtue of obedience. In *Politics* he states; "Here the very constitution of the soul has shown us the way; in it one part naturally rules, and the other is subject, and the virtue of the ruler we maintain to be different from that of the subject, the one part being the virtue of the rational, and the other of the irrational part. No, it is obvious that the same principle applies generally, and therefore almost all things rule and are ruled according to nature...the male rules over the female." (1260a 4-10) This passage is one in which Aristotle is struggling with the question previously posed by Plato in the *Meno* and *Republic*, namely isn't the same virtue required of all persons, even in different situations. But Aristotle's answer is clear, in this area of ruling and obedience, there are different virtues for the two sexes, and it is clear that ruling is a superior virtue to obedience as it partakes of all of the dynamics of practical wisdom. In the *Politics* he concludes: "Clearly, then, moral virtue belongs to all of them, but the temperance of a man and of a woman / or the courage and justice of a man and of a woman, are not, as Socrates maintained, the same; the courage of a man is shown in commanding, of a woman obeying." (1254b 16-25)

Finally, Aristotle describes a separate sphere of activity as also being a part of sexual differentiation, with the woman overseeing matters of the household and the man in the civis. He suggests that sometimes wealthy women assume more of the ruling function, and that the man rules over his children with a royal rule and over his wife with a constitutional rule, and he concludes: "For although there may be exceptions to the order of nature, the male is by nature more fitted for command than the female." (1259a 35-1259b5) While ordinarily in constitutional rule "the nature of citizens are equal" and they exchange ruling and obeying one another, Aristotle argues that while "the relation of the female is of this kind, but there the inequality is permanent." (ibid) He also concludes, in the *Nicomachean Ethics* that the friendship of woman and man must also be always a friendship of "inequality" because of the "superiority of one party over the other." (1158b 15-30) *

In this analysis of Aristotle's philosophy we have ignored two further aspects of his philosophy: his cosmology and his logic. Both of these aspects play a role in the subsequent philosophy of man and woman. For now, the main point to be emphasized is that Aristotle was the first philosopher to develop a consistent defence for the theory of sex polarity across all four categories of opposites, generation, wisdom, and virtue, and therefore he is properly identified as the founder of the sex polarity theory.

Conclusion

Today we have seen that the philosophy of woman and man has had a significant

Sum
 beginning in western thought. The pre-Socratics raised many fundamental questions about sex identity, and these questions delineated four broad categories: 1) are men and women opposite or the same, 2) how does the contribution of father and mother to generation relate to their respective sex identity, 3) are women and men wise in the same or different ways, and 4) are men and women virtuous in the same or different ways.

Then we saw Plato and Aristotle establish two very different theories of answers to these questions: sex unity and sex polarity. In addition to the fact that these two philosophers were the first to attempt to develop a cohesive theory about the respective identities of men and women across all four categories delineated by the pre-Socratics; they also, in their answers revealed a certain problem that will be characteristic of their theory as it develops in western thought. Namely, within sex unity there is a tendency to devalue the body, and to establish the equality of the dignity and worth of the sexes on a dualism which denies significant material differences between men and women. Within sex polarity differentiation is acknowledged, but a certain aspect of materiality is isolated and emphasized as the important factor that makes one sex superior to the other. For Aristotle it was the matter of heat and the capacity to produce seed that led to a theory of the inequality between the sexes.

The main arguments in the theories of Platonic sex unity or Aristotelian sex polarity established the boundaries for discussions about sex identity for the next millennium. All philosophers during this early time in western intellectual history all fell into some form of unity or polarity or a combination of both. In the next lecture we will trace the

subsequent development of the philosophy of man and woman through its significant turning points in medieval and modern philosophy.

Break and Discussion

C

C

C